1	ADMIN. JUDGE SIPPEL: He just said
2	it.
3	MR. SCHONMAN: I know Lieutenant
4	Steels is among the individuals who we have
5	discussed and agreed not to call for cross
6	examination. She's one of the testimonial
7	witnesses.
8	The matter about procedures that
9	police may employ that is not an issue in this
LO	proceeding.
L1	ADMIN. JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, it
L2	could on rebuttal. Rebuttal doesn't
13	necessarily go to the heart of the merits of
L4	the case. Rebuttal may go to just basically
15	a way of testing the credibility of what
16	another witness would have; what a main
17	witness is testifying to. It's not bringing
18	Police Officer Steele in for purposes of
19	proving "proving their case." Affirmative
20	defense.
21	MR. SCHONMAN: Your Honor, we'll
22	just have to see how it plays out.

1	ADMIN. JUDGE SIPPEL: All right.
2	MR. ŚCHONMAŃ: I believe it's so
3	tangential to this case that it would
4	certainly be objectionable but we'll see how
5	it plays out.
6	ADMIN. JUDGE SIPPEL: That's fine.
7	That's fair. Okay.
8	Okay. Mr. Lyon, well then what
9	can we do? Can I give you a date certain as
10	to what well, let me ask. Go back again.
11	MR. LYON: April 7th would work.
12	ADMIN. JUDGE SIPPEL: April 2nd.
13	MR. LYON: 7th.
14	ADMIN. JUDGE SIPPEL: 7th to do
15	what now? To rebuttal?
16	MR. LYON: To submit any written
17	rebuttal, etcetera.
18	ADMIN. JUDGE SIPPEL: Now, you
19	okay. All right. Now, let me be clear about
20	that. Because the fact that they're
21	submitted
22	MR. LYON: Doesn't mean they'll be

1	admitted.
2	ADMIN. JUDGE SIPPEL: Doesn't mean
3	they'll be admitted and it doesn't mean that
4	we're going to treat them at the admission
5	session.
6	MR. LYON: That's fine, Your
7	Honor.
8	ADMIN. JUDGE SIPPEL: We may or
9	may not. I'm not going to rule that out. But
10	just as a time and, in fact, even if we
11	should treat them at the admission session,
12	but it would be an entirely different category
13	because they're not going to be relevant to
14	the case or received in any way shape or form
15	except as a proffer until after the close of
16	the case in chief. And then I can make a
17	determination of when I need it.
18	I mean, it might make logical
19	sense on April 7th, but after the actual
20	hearing it might make no sense.
21	Am I being clear?
22	MR. SCHONMAN: Yes.

1	MR. LYON: I understand, Your
2	Honor.
3	ADMIN. JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. April
4	7th to submit rebuttal and Mr. Schonman let me
5	as you this too again.
6	And when I say Mr. Schonman it
7	means both counsel, of course.
8	What about this business of a
9	video phone? It would something less than
10	live but something more than telephone cross.
11	MR. SCHONMAN: Are you talking for
12	rebuttal?
13	ADMIN. JUDGE SIPPEL: To cross
14	examine on rebuttal.
15	MR. SCHONMAN: We would prefer to
16	have rebuttal witnesses with the exception of
17	Dr. Allmon, if there are rebuttal witnesses
18	at all to appear in person.
19	ADMIN. JUDGE SIPPEL: What would
20	be the problem with the video phone?
21	MR. SCHONMAN: The problem is that
22	we think it's more beneficial to have the

1 }	individual present here where you can observe
2	first-hand their demeanor and movements,
3	facial expressions, body expressions in the
4	courtroom. These are individuals we have not
5	seen, not spoken to at all.
6	MR. LYON: Your Honor, other than
7	in the courtroom that would all be available
8	on the video.
9	ADMIN. JUDGE SIPPEL: Yes. That's
10	what I was just going to ask. I mean, won't
11	I be able to do all that except for I can't
12	reach out and touch the person but I can see,
13	hear, assess?
14	MR. SCHONMAN: Your Honor, let me
15	say this: We might agree to it, to the video
16	arrangement once we see what testimony they're
17	proffering and if Your Honor determines that
18	rebuttal is even necessary.
19	ADMIN. JUDGE SIPPEL: That's fair.
20	All right. So, it's open. We'll leave it
21	open.
22	And one of the reasons I'm very

concerned about trying to get as much as I can on that and your positions is because we're going to have to make some inquiries as to what's available. And I don't want to be spending time going down a rabbit hole if we're not going to use it.

But I would urge it and something like rebuttal. Cross examination on rebuttal in a case of this nature, i.e., being when you're not dealing with, you know, the top 20 companies or something, that inexhaustible resources, that this would make sense to me unless I'm missing something. Okay. Then I think that's it.

Now, what I'm going to do then. I want to be clear in my own mind. What I'm going to do. I'm going to issue the order and the order is going to say that the Bureau is - can I same that the Bureau is considering recasting the testimony of Detective Shilling? Or you're pretty much resolved on that?

MR. SCHONMAN: I think what we

1	would prefer is that if you want to reflect it
2	in your order, that we will discuss with Mr.
3	Lyon the extent to which we can retain our
4	existing direct testimony and eliminate those
5	few portions where he refers to his
6	professional opinion.
7	ADMIN. JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, okay.
8	Just in horseback parlance here, you'll
9	discuss editing out references to professional
10	opinion or in reference to, in fact,
11	conclusions based on
12	MR. SCHONMAN: His expressions of
13	professional opinion.
14	ADMIN. JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. I
15	mean. All right.
16	MR. SCHONMAN: I mean, essentially
17	what we'll be discussing out of the context of
18	the admission session is a pre-admission
19	session which we had not originally
20	contemplated, but I think for all intents and
21	purposes that's what Your Honor is proposing
22	now is that we engage in a pre-admission

session with opposing counsel.

1

2

3

4

5

б

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

ADMIN. JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, anything that you do on trial preparation you're going to do with opposing counsel. You can call it anything you want. Maybe you can stipulate things on it. I don't care how you do it. The point is that on the admissions day I'm hoping that I'm not going to have to wrestle with a line by line breakdown of his testimony with respect to whether or not it's I'm hoping. And I know an opinion or not. there are going to certain sentences paragraphs where that's going to be impossible. I'm going to have to. But, you know, it's all a question of how much time you spend, you know, working on the transcript and al1.

So, I mean, everybody benefits from shortening these procedures. I think.

Okay. Well, so anyway, there's going to be a discussion outside trying to -
I'll find some very vague way of saying it so

1	that you're not pinned down. Certainly on
2	April 7th, Mr. Lyon is going to submit his
3	proposed rebuttal and possibly with one, two
4	or three of these named witnesses.
5	Is there anything else?
6	Cross examination by speaker phone
7	or otherwise.
8	We got Sherman and Dr I'm
9	sorry.
10	MR. LYON: Dr. Allmon.
11	ADMIN. JUDGE SIPPEL: Dr. Allmon
12	and who was the other person that's going to
13	be cross examined? Sherman?
14	MR. LYON: Shilling.
15	ADMIN. JUDGE SIPPEL: Shilling?
16	MR. SCHONMAN: Detective Shilling.
17	ADMIN. JUDGE SIPPEL: Yes.
18	Detective Shilling is going to be here.
19	MR. SCHONMAN: Correct.
20	ADMIN. JUDGE SIPPEL: And Mr.
21	Titus is going to be here. But there was
22	another witness

1	MR. SCHONMAN: Oh, well, Mr.
2	Sherman.
3	ADMIN. JUDGE SIPPEL: Sherman.
4	MR. KNOWLES-KELLETT: Sherman and
5	Allmon are the two on cross.
6	ADMIN. JUDGE SIPPEL: That's what
7	I'm trying, yes.
8	MR. LYON: Shilling and Titus are
9	the two
LO	ADMIN. JUDGE SIPPEL: That's
11	exactly. That's what I was saying. Sherman.
12	Okay. All right.
13	Shilling and Titus live, Sherman
14	and Allmon by speaker phone, cross examine.
15	Well, wait a minute. Now, Dr.
16	Allmon and Sherman are going to testify by
17	speaker phone directly. No. I'm sorry. They
18	already testified with their written
19	testimony.
20	They are going to be cross
21	examined or available for cross examine by
22	speaker phone.

MR. SCHONMAN: Correct.
ADMIN. JUDGE SIPPEL: Shilling and
Titus are going to be available in court to be
cross examined.
On the 7th we're going to get the
submission of rebuttal. In the meantime
you're out talking on the rebuttal. I'm
sorry, not the rebuttal.
MR. SCHONMAN: Detective Shilling
is direct.
ADMIN. JUDGE SIPPEL: Yes. The
question of Detective Shilling's direct
testimony.
Now, where does that leave us with
respect to I conditioned the need for these
bench briefs on the meaning of Rule 26? Can
we put that aside for now? It seems to me
that we can.
MR. SCHONMAN: I think we can put
it aside for now.
ADMIN. JUDGE SIPPEL: What do you
think

1 MR. LYON: I think we can put it 2 aside if Bureau counsel and I can agree as to 3 the limits of Mr. Shilling's testimony and 4 I'll give a good faith attempt to do so. Ι 5 just don't think it's likely. 6 ADMIN. JUDGE SIPPEL: 7 MR. LYON: Because from what Mr. Schonman is saying, I think, his view of the 8 9 expert testimony and Mr. Shilling's exhibit is substantially narrower than my interpretation 10 11 of Mr. Shilling's degree of expert testimony. 12 JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, is ADMIN. 13 there something definitive that you both could 14 exchange? Not exchange, rather but that the Bureau -- could you give them in advance, look 15 16 what it is that you're willing to exclude 17 by say around April the 1st or so? If I could suggest, 18 LYON: Your Honor, that we keep the April 1 and April 19 20 7 dates with the proviso that if we can agree as to Shilling's testimony that those briefs 21

won't be necessary?

22

1 MR. SCHONMAN: Your Honor, it may 2 come down to the Bureau agreeing to proffer 3 Detective Shilling as a fact witness who would 4 testify about his knowledge of the situation 5 involving Mr. Titus, his experiences, his 6 background. He can testify about all those 7 things as a fact witness. What he has done or 8 he through. What what processes went 9 processes he's required to go through and 10 merely omit references to his opinion, 11 which case the bench memo regarding Rule 26 12 would not be necessary. 13 Again, I think Mr. MR. LYON: Schonman's statement reflects his narrow view 14 15 the expert nature of of Mr. Shilling's It doesn't reflect my view which 16 testimony. is essentially that nine out of the 10 pages 17 18 amount to expert testimony. 19 ADMIN. JUDGE SIPPEL: Well. 20 there's always going to be that disagreement. 21 I'm seeing that the Bureau has backed off 22 considerably from its initial decision on this

7	and I don't want to put any party to the task
2	of, you know, of a bench brief on a point that
3	it can be very quickly mooted is what I'm
4	saying. And I don't know whether that's going
5	to happen or not.
6	MR. LYON: I will undertake to
7	confer with the Bureau by tomorrow and see if
8	we can narrow this down, Your Honor.
9	ADMIN. JUDGE SIPPEL: You know
10	MR. SCHONMAN: Your Honor, you
11	know, the Bureau is willing to work with Mr.
12	Lyon on this and I think your assessment is
13	entirely accurate. We are going to great
14	lengths to try to streamline this.
15	I will note that Mr. Titus'
16	counsel, with the exception of Exhibit 1,
17	Bureau Exhibit 1 which is a copy of Mr. Titus'
18	license, has objected to every one of our
19	exhibits. Every one of them.
20	I don't see that as contributing
21	towards a streamlined process.

Your Honor --

MR. LYON:

22

1	MR. SCHONMAN: That everyone of
2	our exhibits has a problem.
3	MR. LYON: Your Honor, if counsel
4	wants to get into an argument on admissions,
5	I'm more than willing to do it. I'm prepared
6	to do the entire set of exhibits right now.
7	But I don't think that you are
8	ADMIN. JUDGE SIPPEL: I'm not.
9	MR. LYON: And, you know, the
10	exhibits are riddled with hearsay and there's
L1	testimony based on witnesses who haven't been
12	tendered. I mean, there's a letter. One of
13	the exhibits has a letter to a Congressman or
14	to a Senator from a witness who is not even
15	tendered here.
16	What am I supposed to do other
17	than to object to that type of hearsay?
18	ADMIN. JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, to me
19	that's a routine objection.
20	MR. SCHONMAN: It would be if he
21	had an understanding of why the letter is
22	coming in. And, of course, that's something

that we can discuss at the admission session.
ADMIN. JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, you
can make your proffer. But it's not coming in
for the truth that's served therein?
MR. SCHONMAN: No, sir. It's not.
MR. LYON: If it doesn't, Your
Honor, then I think that I don't see the
relevance of it. The fact that someone might
have if it's coming in for the fact that
there's somebody who is concerned because Mr.
Titus had a sex offense 15 years ago, I don't
think that's probative of the determination
that you have to make. And I can't see any
other purpose for it.
MR. SCHONMAN: Your Honor, are we
having the admission session now or not?
ADMIN. JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, maybe
there's a quick answer to this.
Is there a quick answer to this?
MR. SCHONMAN: I don't know if
there's a quick answer to anything but I will
say that it certainly is probative of

1	someone's state of mind. Of why this case is
2	even before Your Honor.
3	MR. LYON: Because a senator
4	complained.
5	ADMIN. JUDGE SIPPEL: Wait a
6	minute. Wait a minute. Don't get ahead of
7	me.
8	Whose state of mind, the Bureau's
9	state of mind? I think that's what I heard
10	and I think that's right.
11	Let's cool it. Let's cool it. As
12	cool people say, let's cool it.
13	We're making a lot of progress
14	actually despite what some may think. We are
15	making progress. I think we should just leave
16	it the way it is.
17	But here is what I'm going to do.
18	There's a lot to do on the 7th
19	already.
20	Why don't we do this. On the 4th
21	which is a Friday, I won't be here, but it
22	will be waiting for me when I come back.

1	I'd like a joint status report on
2	what's been accomplished between now and then.
3	MR. LYON: That's April 4, Your
4	Honor?
5	ADMIN. JUDGE SIPPEL: April the
6	4th. It's a Friday. It's a Friday. The 4th
7	of April.
8	And the reason I say on the 4th is
9	and certainly if there is any change you
10	can because there's a lot to do on the 7th
11	with your, you know, proposed rebuttal
12	testimony and that type of thing. I don't
13	want to pile up on the 7th.
14	Would you rather do it on the 7th?
1.5	MR. LYON: The 4th is fine, Your
16	Honor.
17	ADMIN. JUDGE SIPPEL: Because I
18	won't be here to read it on the 4th, but at
19	least it will be here when I get in and it
20	will help me in terms of deciding whether or
21	not we need another conference before the
1	11

22

admission session.

1	I'm hoping that this can all be
2	worked out and I think it can and I understand
3	the Bureau's position. And you've been very
4	patient. You've been very patient. And I
5	certainly well, I've expressed myself with
6	respect to Mr. Lyon's argument on fairness and
7	so I'm not going to say anything more about
8	that.
9	Let's see if I can get this order
10	out in due course and that I cover all the
11	points.
12	Anything more?
13	From the Bureau?
14	MR. SCHONMAN: No, sir.
15	ADMIN. JUDGE SIPPEL: Mr. Lyon?
16	MR. LYON: No, Your Honor.
17	ADMIN. JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. Then
18	we are in recess until 9:30 on the 14th of
19	April.
20	Thank you very much.
21	(Whereupon, the above matter was
22	concluded at 10:29 a.m.)
	·

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER, TRANSCRIBER, AND PROOFREADER

David L. Titus

Name of Hearing

EB DOCKET NO. 07-13

Docket No. (if applicable)

445 12th STREET, S.W., WASHINGTON, D.C.

Place of Hearing

March 11, 2008

Date of Hearing

We, the undersigned, do hereby certify that the foregoing pages, numbers 1 through 9, inclusive, are the true, accurate and complete transcript prepared from the reporting by

Kevin Connolly (Reporter's Name) in attendance at the above identified hearing, in accordance with applicable provisions of the current Federal Communications Commission's professional verbatim reporting and transcription statement of Work and have verified the accuracy of the accuracy of the transcript by (1) comparing the typewritten transcript against the reporting or recording accomplished at the hearings and (2) comparing the final proofed typewritten transcript against the reporting or recording accomplished at the hearing or conference.

March 24, 200	08 Kevin Connol	14 RevinConnolly
Date		and Signature of Reporter any:Neal Gross Co
March 24, 200	Judy Hadley	Judy Hadley
Date	Legible Name Name of Compa	and Signature of Transcriber
	Name of Compa	anty:Near Gross co
March 24, 200	8 Tracy Cain	Tracestain
Date	Legible Name	and Signature of Proofreader
	Name of Compa	